

Applicants submit that Barkans, Masterson, and Friedman neither discloses nor suggests “a one-dimensional bit conversion table” for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claims 2 and 10. Claim 20 depends from claim 2. Claim 21 depends from claim 10. Applicants submit that claims 20 and 21 are patentable over Barkans, Masterson, and Friedman for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barkans in view of Masterson and U.S. Patent No. 4,725,828 to Cowlshaw. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 3, 5 and 7 depend from claim 1, and recite the features of claim 1 as if set forth therein in its entirety. Claims 13, 15 and 17 depend from claim 11, and recite the features of claim 11 as if set forth therein in its entirety. Applicants submit that Cowlshaw neither discloses nor suggests the features of claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 15 and 17 which are not disclosed or suggested by Barkans and Masterson, as demonstrated above. Applicants submit that claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 15 and 17 are patentable over the combination of Barkans, Masterson, and Cowlshaw for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 15 and 17. Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Claims 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barkans in view of Masterson, Friedman, and Cowlshaw. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 4, 6 and 8 depend from claim 2, and recite the features of claim 2 as if set forth therein in its entirety. Claims 12, 14 and 16 depend from claim 10, and recite the features of claim 10 as if set forth therein in its entirety. Applicants submit that Barkans, Masterson, Friedman, and Cowlshaw neither discloses nor suggests the features of claims 4, 6, 8, 12, 14 and 16 which are not disclosed or suggested by Barkans and Masterson, as demonstrated above. Applicants submit that claims 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16 are patentable over the combination of Barkans, Masterson, Friedman and Cowlshaw for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claims 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16. Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated January 12, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: April 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant